

Unit 6: Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Reviews



79

Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Reviews

Key Words and Issues

“**multi-jurisdictional**” plans take many forms – from true regional plans with global priorities to collections of what are essentially all local level plans

“**participation**” can be met through “adoption” only if all opportunities are available and the adopting communit(ies) are not coerced

Available Resources

Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance



80

Unit 7: State and Tribal Plan Reviews



81

State and Tribal Plan Reviews

Key Words and Issues

Timing is “off for integration of local and state planning efforts (for this round

“**enhanced**” plans do **not** mean bigger and better “**standard**” plans

“**enhanced state program certification process**”

tribal governments can submit as local, state or both

Available Resources

Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance



82

Unit 8: Manmade Hazard Mitigation Planning



83

Manmade Hazard Mitigation Planning

Key Words and Issues

“**manmade**” hazards are not included (for now) as primary hazards but often need to be accounted for as a secondary effect of natural hazard events (e.g., the nuclear reactor on the earthquake fault line or the refinery in the floodplain)

Available Resources

How-to #7

FEMA Antiterrorism website



84

Unit 8: Manmade Hazard Considerations

Required? No.

Recommended? Maybe...

- Where might manmade hazards show up in plans?

Local expectations

- Value of awareness




Date 85

Manmade Hazard Considerations

Technical assistance

- In-house
- FEMA guidance




<http://www.fema.gov/fima/antiterrorism>

<http://www.fema.gov/fima/rmsp.shtm>



Date 86

Manmade Hazard Considerations



pp. 2-5 and 2-6



pp. 3-4 and 3-5



Date 87

Manmade Hazard Considerations

Information sensitivity

- Legal aspects
- Public Participation
- Handling practices
- Reality check



<http://www.iooss.gov>



Date 88

Unit 9: Odds and Ends



89

Odds and Ends

Questions regarding situations the Region staff have already encountered (regional differences? confidentiality?, capability assessments?)

Techniques for consistency in plan reviews

- the “buddy” system

- individuals filling consistent roles (one person reviews all the planning process sections, etc.)

- support via FEMA HQ such as FAQ's

NEMIS and the Plan Repository

Final Rule development and the contributions plan reviewers can make



90

Odds and Ends

What happens after November 1, 2004? in terms of:

- monitoring implementation of the plan's recommendations
(including addressing data deficiencies)

- references to plans in post-disaster situations where the plans have
been changed and/or updated but not resubmitted to FEMA

- updating plans during and/or at the end of the regulatory time limits
(3 years for States and 5 years for local communities)

Planning Guidance versus Interim Criteria: can both be used or has
the Planning Guidance superceded and completely replaced the
Interim Criteria?

